

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

IVAN LEE MATTHEWS, II,

Plaintiff

Case No. 3:19-cv-00252-MMD-CLB

ORDER

v.

WILLIAM REUBART et al.,

Defendants

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by a state prisoner. On May 14, 2020, the Court issued an order dismissing the Complaint with leave to amend and directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 30 days. (ECF No. 3 at 6-7.) The 30-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)

1 (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

2 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey  
3 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:  
4 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to  
5 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring  
6 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.  
7 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at  
8 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

9 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously  
10 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of  
11 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of  
12 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay  
13 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*  
14 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring  
15 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
16 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey  
17 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"  
18 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d  
19 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 30 days  
20 expressly stated: "It is further ordered that, if Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint  
21 curing the deficiencies outlined in this order, this action will be dismissed with prejudice  
22 for failure to state a claim." (ECF No. 3 at 7.) Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that  
23 dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file an amended  
24 complaint within 30 days.

25 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed with prejudice based on  
26 Plaintiff's failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with this Court's May 14,  
27 2020, order and for failure to state a claim.

28 ///

1 It is further ordered that the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 1) is  
2 denied as moot.

3 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court will close the case and enter judgment  
4 accordingly.

5  
6 DATED THIS 23<sup>rd</sup> day of June 2020.

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 MIRANDA M. DU  
10 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28